



Southeast Coast Network  
Atlanta, Georgia

## Meeting Minutes

*2004 Technical Steering Committee Meeting, 24- 25 August, Atlanta, GA*

*Attendees:*

	Superintendents	Steering Committee	Others
CANA	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> John Stiner	
CAHA / FORA / WRBR	<input type="checkbox"/> Larry Belli	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jim Ebert	
CALO	<input type="checkbox"/> Bob Vogel	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Michael Rikard	
CASA / FOMA	<input type="checkbox"/> Gordie Wilson	<input type="checkbox"/> Dave Parker	
CHAT	<input type="checkbox"/> Kevin Cheri	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> David Lairson	Nina Hemphill
COSW	<input type="checkbox"/> Martha Bogle	<input type="checkbox"/> Bill Hulslander	Theresa Yednock
CUIS	<input type="checkbox"/> Art Frederick	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> John Fry	
FOFR	<input type="checkbox"/> Mike Tennent	<input type="checkbox"/> Denise Spear	
FOPU	<input type="checkbox"/> John Breen	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cliff Kevill	
FOSU / MOCR / CHPI	<input type="checkbox"/> John Tucker	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sandy Pusey	
HOBE	<input type="checkbox"/> Mark Lewis	<input type="checkbox"/> Jim Cahill	
KEMO	<input type="checkbox"/> John Cissell	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Willie Johnson	
MOCR	<input type="checkbox"/> Ann Childress	<input type="checkbox"/> Linda Brown	
OCMU	<input type="checkbox"/> Jim David	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Guy LaChine	
TIMU / FOCA	<input type="checkbox"/> Barbara Goodman	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Richard Bryant	
SECN	<input type="checkbox"/> Larry West	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Joe DeVivo	Mike Byrne
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Christina Wright	Sara McCort
SERO			
CESU		<input type="checkbox"/> Ray Albright	

---

# Meeting Notes

## Purpose of Meeting

Discuss Phase I report and identify necessary revisions prior to submission to WASO, set the framework for completing Phase II and Phase III, and to begin planning next year's work plan.

## Context

Our Phase I report is completed, and we're on track to finish *at least* Phase II by the end of next FY. The schedule and workplan for next FY (and beyond) is largely dependent on how much we try to accomplish next year. And if we do wish to continue on an accelerated schedule, we want to plan network staff time now even though our workplan is not due to WASO until November.

## Notes from the various topic areas:

1. Consensus / agreement on "final" Phase I report to be submitted to WASO
  - a. Clarification on contents of Appendix 3 (historical / ongoing monitoring) and identification of gaps and additional needs.
    - i. Generated a list of other sources of monitoring info / data to follow up on. These will be incorporated into Appendix 3 prior to submission of the Phase I report (although they may be "placeholders" until the Phase II report.
  - b. Prioritized list of pertinent statistics / factoids to be developed and included with park maps (Appendix 6).
    - i. Stats to possibly pursue for one or more of the parks where it makes sense.
      - Acres: legislated, total, above/below high tide, park owned,
      - Acres of freshwater ponds, wetlands, uplands, marsh, submerged, aquatic, overwash, ephemeral pools, other main habitat types and resource groups
      - Species: lists, number of species per faunal group, T&Es, general wildlife, total
      - Location of overwash
      - Miles of boundary: soundside, adjacent to private property, authorized, trails, orv trails, river miles, beach
      - Topography / altitude
      - # of ORV access points
      - #, location of boat access points
      - # of arch & historic sites

- Number of horses
- ii. Factoids:
- Link to directions to park
  - Outstanding features (3 or 4)
  - Year park established
  - Park purpose
  - Type of visitation
  - Areas of greatest visitor impact
  - Annual visitation
  - Ferry info
  - Permit info / point of contact
  - Addresses
  - Representative photo
  - “For further information” link, or to other web sites
- iii. Action items:
- Sara will make a mockup and submit to parks for review. Not to be done for Phase I report submission (maps are okay as is).
- c. Clarification on contents of Appendix 8 (water resources) and identification of gaps and additional needs.
- i. Action items:
- Include network-wide map of 303-d streams in Chapter 1 and Appendix 8 (it was in Mike’s presentation) prior to submission of Phase I report ([COMPLETED](#)).
  - Fix waterbodies table based on comments from TSC members present ([COMPLETED](#)).
- d. Appendix 9: Monitoring Questions
- i. Recognition of need to do some “lumping” and “splitting” among the categories. This will happen as a part of the Phase II process.
- ii. After the discussion, several of the priority scores needed to be changed for many of the questions prior to submission of the Phase I Report ([COMPLETED](#)). The only changes to

the overall analysis are as follows:

- Soundscape no longer has an average greater than 3.
  - More questions related to water quality, coastal erosion, and wetlands rose to adjusted averages >3.
  - Neither of the changes altered the seven key areas of concern listed in the synthesis portion of the appendix and in Chapter 1.
- e. Two lists of “to-do” items: one for prior to submission, and one for next FY.
2. Common understanding of the “next steps” involved with developing the monitoring plan, and agreement on schedule of events to complete Phase II and Phase III.
- a. Christina gave a presentation on the overall “big data management picture” (i.e., what types of things she’s going to have to account for in the plan). The major points were as follows:
- i. She’ll be planning means to deal with data / information throughout the entire project life cycle (from inception to archives)
  - ii. This includes converting data into useful information to park managers
  - iii. This is being looked at as a major component of the Phase III report (and the overall I&M program)
- b. Other SOPs of interest:
- i. What constitutes a data release, and how should it be handled?
  - ii. Reporting guidelines and caveats (Joe’s note a day later: we might also want to think about formalizing a review process for reports that we’ll produce based on inventory and monitoring data)
- c. Laurie Foley from DataLOGIC presented the overall process that they will be using to help develop the Network’s data management plan. They will be focusing primarily on helping us define what constitutes “useful information” (i.e., maps, tables, ...) as opposed to raw data.
- d. Laurie facilitated a session that took the seven key natural resources issues (identified in Appendix 9) and developed refined management-specific questions. These were very similar to those included in Appendix 9. Several were added to the list, including several relating to ecosystem disturbance and museum management.
3. Agreement on priorities for FY 2005 budget
- a. The “how are we going to pick our vital signs” question came up, particularly because there was some concern that issues that were of low priority, but of priority to all parks, seemed to be being downgraded. Joe presented the methods we’re using to get there from here (in Appendix 4), and tried to explain how those concerns will be addressed during the process.

- b. We went over the budget for next year.
  - i. We're expecting full funding, but likely not until February.
  - ii. No museum specialist can be hired until a budget is passed.
- c. Schedule for next year
  - i. Consensus was reached that it makes sense to continue at an accelerated schedule, with completion of Phase II before the end of FY05 (our drop-dead date) and Phase III to be completed as soon as feasible there after. Nobody advocated for spending 2.5 years on Phase II and Phase III if we don't need to.
- d. We talked about the vegetation mapping proposals / project
  - i. Costs ranged from 1.6 – 2.0 million for the entire network.
  - ii. Most of that was salary for the investigators.
  - iii. Consensus was reached (adamantly) that we need to find a way to get this done sooner rather than later, and that we should try to use a portion of our budget to cost share the work with WASO if that's what it takes.
- e. Options for network projects for next year:
  - i. Add more money to veg mapping than the 200K we currently have in the budget.
  - ii. Exotic plant distribution
  - iii. Air Quality effects on park resources
  - iv. Exotic wildlife inventories / monitoring
  - v. Total watershed assessments at those watersheds where it's not happening now.
  - vi. Wetland inventories
  - vii. Neotropical / migratory bird studies
  - viii. Shorebird habitat quality
  - ix. Water quality monitoring
- f. Action items:
  - i. SECN staff will develop a proposal to submit to WASO to try and get some additional \$ to get our parks moved up in the vegetation mapping priority list.
  - ii. Joe will compile the project justifications developed during the breakout session and send to the TSC for review.
  - iii. Based on comments / recommendations from the TSC one or more multi-park proposals

might be developed submitted in the combined call by the network.

- iv. Get meeting dates on people's schedule sooner rather than later.